

10-27-04

1647
Blw/B

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. ED 277037078 US, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: October 26, 2004

Signature: Linda Blake

(Linda Blake)

Docket No.: JJJ-P04-523
(PATENT)



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Dijke et al.

Confirmation No.: 7785

Application No.: 09/982543

Art Unit: 1647

Filed: October 18, 2001

Examiner: R. S. Landsman

For: METHODS OF IDENTIFYING MORPHOGEN
RECEPTOR-BINDING ANALOGS

Date: October 26, 2004

COMMUNICATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants hereby request the United States Patent and Trademark Office issue a corrected official filing receipt for the above-identified application. The issued official filing receipt dated May 10, 2002 does not reflect the correct priority claim. The complete correct priority data should read:

This application is a con of 08/448,371 06/02/1995
Which is a CIP of 08/236,428 04/29/1994 ABD

Applicants previously filed a Supplemental Application Data Sheet on September 9, 2003 which reflects the above priority claim. Applicants also amended the first paragraph of the specification in an Amendment filed on August 11, 2003 to reflect the priority information. The Supplemental Application Data Sheet and Amendment are attached as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

Applicants note that the above-identified application is allowed for issuance as a patent and respectfully request that the above priority data be reflected in the printed patent to be issued.


Serial No.: 09/982,543

Docket No.: JJJ-P04-523

Applicant believes no fee is due with this communication. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. JJJ-P04-523 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Erika Takeuchi

Registration No.: 55,661

ROPES & GRAY LLP

45 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, New York 10111-0087

(212) 497-3625

(212) 497-3650 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

DIJKE et al.

Serial No: 09/982,543

Filed: October 18, 2001

For: Methods of Identifying Morphogen
Receptor-Binding Analogs

Attorney Docket No. JJJ-P04-523

Art Unit: 1647

Examiner: Landsman, Robert

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below:

September 9, 2003

Date of Signature
and of Mail Deposit


Joanne Ryan

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

Sir:

This supplemental response is being filed in reply to the Office Action, mailed May 9, 2003, in connection with the above application. The period for response has been extended to September 9, 2003, by the accompanying petition for one month extension.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS

The Office Action points out certain inconsistencies found in the Oath / Declaration, which is a copy of the Oath / Declaration of the parent application U.S.S.N. 08/448,371. Applicants hereby submit a supplemental ADS (Application Data Sheets) in accordance with 37 CFR 1.76(c) to correct these defects. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.76(d), ADS governs inconsistencies in domestic and foreign priority claims between an earlier filed Oath / Declaration and a later filed ADS.

Applicants also submit herewith the formal drawings.


CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. The Examiner may address any questions raised by this submission to the undersigned at 617-951-7000. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition therefor and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 18-1945**.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 9, 2003

Customer No: 28120
Docketing Specialist
Ropes & Gray, LLP
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617-951-7000
Fax: 617-951-7050



Yu Lu, Ph.D.
Patent Agent
Reg. No. 50,306

Supplemental Application Data Sheet**Application Information**

Application number:: 09/982543
Filing Date:: 10/18/01
Application Type:: Regular
Subject Matter:: Utility
Suggested Group Art Unit:: 1647
CD-ROM or CD-R?: None
Sequence submission?: Paper
Computer Readable Form (CRF)?:: Yes
Number of copies of CRF:: 1
Title:: METHODS OF IDENTIFYING
MORPHOGEN RECEPTOR BINDING
ANALOGS

Attorney Docket Number:: JJJ-P04-523

Request for Early Publication?: No
Request for Non-Publication?: No
Total Drawing Sheets:: 3
Small Entity?: No
Petition included?: No
Secrecy Order in Parent Appl.?: No

Applicant Information

Applicant Authority Type:: Inventor
Primary Citizenship Country:: Netherlands
Status:: Full Capacity
Given Name:: Peter
Middle Name:: T.
Family Name:: Dijke
City of Residence:: Uppsala

Country of Residence:: Sweden
Street of mailing address:: Husargatan 3
City of mailing address:: Uppsala
Country of mailing address:: Sweden
Postal or Zip Code of mailing address:: 751 23

Applicant Authority Type:: Inventor
Primary Citizenship Country:: Sweden
Status:: Full Capacity
Given Name:: Carl-Henrik
Family Name:: Heldin
City of Residence:: Uppsala
Country of Residence:: Sweden
Street of mailing address:: Husargatan 3
City of mailing address:: Uppsala
Country of mailing address:: Sweden
Postal or Zip Code of mailing address:: 751 23

Applicant Authority Type:: Inventor
Primary Citizenship Country:: Japan
Status:: Full Capacity
Given Name:: Kohei
Family Name:: Miyazono
City of Residence:: Saitama
Country of Residence:: Japan
Street of mailing address:: 5-5-34 Honcho
City of mailing address:: Saitama
State or Province of mailing address:: Shiki
Country of mailing address:: Japan
Postal or Zip Code of mailing address:: 353-0004

Applicant Authority Type:: Inventor
 Primary Citizenship Country:: US
 Status:: Full Capacity
 Given Name:: Kuber
 Middle Name:: T.
 Family Name:: Sampath
City of Residence:: Holliston
 State or Province of Residence:: MA
 Country of Residence:: US
Street of mailing address:: 98 Pamela Drive
 City of mailing address:: Holliston
 State or Province of mailing address:: MA
Postal or Zip Code of mailing address:: 01746

Correspondence Information

Correspondence Customer Number:: 28120

Representative Information

Representative Customer Number:: 28120

Domestic Priority Information

Application::	Continuity Type::	Parent Application::	Parent Filing Date::
<u>This Application</u>	<u>Continuation of</u>	<u>08/448371</u>	<u>06/02/95</u>
<u>08/448371</u>	<u>Continuation of</u>	<u>PCT/US95/05467</u>	<u>04/28/95</u>
<u>PCT/US95/05467</u>	<u>Continuation-in-Part</u> <u>of</u>	<u>08/236428</u>	<u>04/29/94</u>

Assignee Information

Assignee name:: Curis, Inc.
Street of mailing address:: 61 Moulton Street
City of mailing address:: Cambridge
State or Province of mailing address:: MA
Postal or Zip Code of mailing address:: 02138

Assignee name:: Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research
Street of mailing address:: 605 Third Avenue
City of mailing address:: New York
State or Province of mailing address:: NY
Postal or Zip Code of mailing address:: 101058

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2003		Complete if Known	
<i>Effective 01/01/2003, Patent fees are subject to annual revision.</i>		Application Number	09/982543
		Filing Date	October 18, 2001
		First Named Inventor	Peter T. Dijke
		Examiner Name	R. Landsman
		Art Unit	1647
		Attorney Docket No.	JJJ-P04-523
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27			
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$)		110.00	

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)	FEE CALCULATION (continued)																																																																																																																																																																																		
<input type="checkbox"/> Check <input type="checkbox"/> Credit Card <input type="checkbox"/> Money Order <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> None <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 18-1945 Deposit Account Name: Ropes & Gray LLP The Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charge fee(s) indicated below <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit any overpayments <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application <input type="checkbox"/> Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.	3. ADDITIONAL FEES <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Large Entity</th> <th colspan="2">Small Entity</th> <th rowspan="2">Fee Description</th> <th rowspan="2">Fee Paid</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Fee Code</th> <th>Fee (\$)</th> <th>Fee Code</th> <th>Fee (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1051</td><td>130</td><td>2051</td><td>65</td><td>Surcharge - late filing fee or oath</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1052</td><td>50</td><td>2052</td><td>25</td><td>Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1053</td><td>130</td><td>1053</td><td>130</td><td>Non-English specification</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1812</td><td>2,520</td><td>1812</td><td>2,520</td><td>For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1804</td><td>920*</td><td>1804</td><td>920*</td><td>Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1805</td><td>1,840*</td><td>1805</td><td>1,840*</td><td>Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1251</td><td>110</td><td>2251</td><td>55</td><td>Extension for reply within first month</td><td>110.00</td></tr> <tr><td>1252</td><td>410</td><td>2252</td><td>205</td><td>Extension for reply within second month</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1253</td><td>930</td><td>2253</td><td>465</td><td>Extension for reply within third month</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1254</td><td>1,450</td><td>2254</td><td>725</td><td>Extension for reply within fourth month</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1255</td><td>1,970</td><td>2255</td><td>985</td><td>Extension for reply within fifth month</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1401</td><td>320</td><td>2401</td><td>160</td><td>Notice of Appeal</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1402</td><td>320</td><td>2402</td><td>160</td><td>Filing a brief in support of an appeal</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1403</td><td>280</td><td>2403</td><td>140</td><td>Request for oral hearing</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1451</td><td>1,510</td><td>1451</td><td>1,510</td><td>Petition to institute a public use proceeding</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1452</td><td>110</td><td>2452</td><td>55</td><td>Petition to revive - unavoidable</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1453</td><td>1,300</td><td>2453</td><td>650</td><td>Petition to revive - unintentional</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1501</td><td>1,300</td><td>2501</td><td>650</td><td>Utility issue fee (or reissue)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1502</td><td>470</td><td>2502</td><td>235</td><td>Design issue fee</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1503</td><td>630</td><td>2503</td><td>315</td><td>Plant issue fee</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1460</td><td>130</td><td>1460</td><td>130</td><td>Petitions to the Commissioner</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1807</td><td>60</td><td>1807</td><td>60</td><td>Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(c)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1806</td><td>180</td><td>1806</td><td>180</td><td>Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8021</td><td>40</td><td>8021</td><td>40</td><td>Recording each patent assignment per property (lines number of properties)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1809</td><td>750</td><td>2809</td><td>375</td><td>Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1810</td><td>750</td><td>2810</td><td>375</td><td>For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1801</td><td>750</td><td>2801</td><td>375</td><td>Request for Continued Examination (RCE)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1802</td><td>900</td><td>1802</td><td>900</td><td>Request for expedited examination of a design application</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath		1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet		1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification		1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination		1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action		1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action		1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	110.00	1252	410	2252	205	Extension for reply within second month		1253	930	2253	465	Extension for reply within third month		1254	1,450	2254	725	Extension for reply within fourth month		1255	1,970	2255	985	Extension for reply within fifth month		1401	320	2401	160	Notice of Appeal		1402	320	2402	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal		1403	280	2403	140	Request for oral hearing		1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding		1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable		1453	1,300	2453	650	Petition to revive - unintentional		1501	1,300	2501	650	Utility issue fee (or reissue)		1502	470	2502	235	Design issue fee		1503	630	2503	315	Plant issue fee		1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner		1807	60	1807	60	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(c)		1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt		8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (lines number of properties)		1809	750	2809	375	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))		1810	750	2810	375	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))		1801	750	2801	375	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)		1802	900	1802	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	
Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid																																																																																																																																																																														
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)																																																																																																																																																																																
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath																																																																																																																																																																															
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet																																																																																																																																																																															
1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification																																																																																																																																																																															
1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for <i>ex parte</i> reexamination																																																																																																																																																																															
1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action																																																																																																																																																																															
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action																																																																																																																																																																															
1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	110.00																																																																																																																																																																														
1252	410	2252	205	Extension for reply within second month																																																																																																																																																																															
1253	930	2253	465	Extension for reply within third month																																																																																																																																																																															
1254	1,450	2254	725	Extension for reply within fourth month																																																																																																																																																																															
1255	1,970	2255	985	Extension for reply within fifth month																																																																																																																																																																															
1401	320	2401	160	Notice of Appeal																																																																																																																																																																															
1402	320	2402	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal																																																																																																																																																																															
1403	280	2403	140	Request for oral hearing																																																																																																																																																																															
1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding																																																																																																																																																																															
1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable																																																																																																																																																																															
1453	1,300	2453	650	Petition to revive - unintentional																																																																																																																																																																															
1501	1,300	2501	650	Utility issue fee (or reissue)																																																																																																																																																																															
1502	470	2502	235	Design issue fee																																																																																																																																																																															
1503	630	2503	315	Plant issue fee																																																																																																																																																																															
1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner																																																																																																																																																																															
1807	60	1807	60	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(c)																																																																																																																																																																															
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt																																																																																																																																																																															
8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (lines number of properties)																																																																																																																																																																															
1809	750	2809	375	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))																																																																																																																																																																															
1810	750	2810	375	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))																																																																																																																																																																															
1801	750	2801	375	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)																																																																																																																																																																															
1802	900	1802	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application																																																																																																																																																																															
1. BASIC FILING FEE <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Large Entity</th> <th colspan="2">Small Entity</th> <th rowspan="2">Fee Description</th> <th rowspan="2">Fee Paid</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Fee Code</th> <th>Fee (\$)</th> <th>Fee Code</th> <th>Fee (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1001</td><td>750</td><td>2001</td><td>375</td><td>Utility filing fee</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1002</td><td>330</td><td>2002</td><td>165</td><td>Design filing fee</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1003</td><td>520</td><td>2003</td><td>260</td><td>Plant filing fee</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1004</td><td>750</td><td>2004</td><td>375</td><td>Reissue filing fee</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1005</td><td>160</td><td>2005</td><td>80</td><td>Provisional filing fee</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: right;">SUBTOTAL (1) (\$) 0.00</p>	Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	1001	750	2001	375	Utility filing fee		1002	330	2002	165	Design filing fee		1003	520	2003	260	Plant filing fee		1004	750	2004	375	Reissue filing fee		1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee																																																																																																																																												
Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description			Fee Paid																																																																																																																																																																												
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)																																																																																																																																																																																
1001	750	2001	375	Utility filing fee																																																																																																																																																																															
1002	330	2002	165	Design filing fee																																																																																																																																																																															
1003	520	2003	260	Plant filing fee																																																																																																																																																																															
1004	750	2004	375	Reissue filing fee																																																																																																																																																																															
1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee																																																																																																																																																																															
2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Large Entity</th> <th colspan="2">Small Entity</th> <th rowspan="2">Fee Description</th> <th rowspan="2">Fee Paid</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Fee Code</th> <th>Fee (\$)</th> <th>Fee Code</th> <th>Fee (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1202</td><td>18</td><td>2202</td><td>9</td><td>Claims in excess of 20</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1201</td><td>84</td><td>2201</td><td>42</td><td>Independent claims in excess of 3</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1203</td><td>280</td><td>2203</td><td>140</td><td>Multiple dependent claim, if not paid</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1204</td><td>84</td><td>2204</td><td>42</td><td>** Reissue independent claims over original patent</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1205</td><td>18</td><td>2205</td><td>9</td><td>** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: right;">SUBTOTAL (2) (\$) 0.00</p>	Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20		1201	84	2201	42	Independent claims in excess of 3		1203	280	2203	140	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid		1204	84	2204	42	** Reissue independent claims over original patent		1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent																																																																																																																																												
Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description			Fee Paid																																																																																																																																																																												
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)																																																																																																																																																																																
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20																																																																																																																																																																															
1201	84	2201	42	Independent claims in excess of 3																																																																																																																																																																															
1203	280	2203	140	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid																																																																																																																																																																															
1204	84	2204	42	** Reissue independent claims over original patent																																																																																																																																																																															
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent																																																																																																																																																																															
*or number previously paid, if greater. For Reissues, see above.		Other fee (specify): _____																																																																																																																																																																																	
SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) 110.00		SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) 110.00																																																																																																																																																																																	

SUBMITTED BY		Complete (if applicable)	
Name (Print/Type)	Yu Lu	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	50,306
Signature		Telephone	(617) 951-7268
		Date	September 9, 2003

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.	
Dated: 9/9/03	Signature: (Joanne Ryan)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
DIJKE *et al.*

Serial No: 09/982,543

Filed: October 18, 2001

For: Methods of Identifying Morphogen
Receptor-Binding Analogs

Attorney Docket No. JJJ-P04-523

Art Unit: 1647


Examiner: Landsman, Robert

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below:

August 11, 2003

Date of Signature
and of Mail Deposit


Joanne Ryan

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

Sir:

This amendment is being filed in reply to the outstanding Office Action, mailed May 9, 2003, in connection with the above application. Please enter the following amendments:

Amendments to the Specification begin on page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 8 of this paper.

Amendments to the Specification:

- On Page 1, please amend the Title to the following new Title:

Methods of Identifying Morphogen Receptor-Binding Analogs MORPHOGENIC
PROTEIN-SPECIFIC CELL SURFACE RECEPTORS AND USES THEREFOR

- On Page 1, please amend the first paragraph to the following rewritten paragraph:

This application is a continuation of U.S. Application No. 08/448,371, filed on June 2, 1995, which is a continuation of International Application No. PCT/US95/05467, filed April 28, 1995, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Application No. 08/236,428, filed April 29, 1994. International Application No. PCT/US95/05467 was published under PCT Article 21(2) in English.

- On Page 11, please amend the second full paragraph to the following rewritten paragraph:

As used herein, all receptor homologies and identities calculated use ALK-6 as the reference sequence, with the extracellular domain reference sequence constituting residues 23-122 of Seq. ID No.7; and the intracellular serine/threonine kinase domain reference sequence constituting residues 206-495 of Seq. ID No.7. Similarly, all OP-1 related protein homologies and identities use OP-1 as the reference sequence, with the C-terminal 102 amino acids described in Seq. ID No. 10 constituting the seven cysteine domain.

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. **(Currently Amended)** A method for identifying ~~an OP-1 receptor~~ a binding analog for a receptor of a morphogen, said morphogen being characterized as sharing at least 60% identity or 70% homology to the C-terminal 102 amino acids of SEQ ID NO: 7, and being able to substitute for OP-1 in binding to SEQ ID NOs. 4, 6, or 8, said analog being characterized as having substantially the same binding affinity for a cell surface said morphogen receptor as OP-1 said morphogen, the method comprising the steps of:
 - (a) providing a sample ~~without a Type II serine/threonine kinase morphogen receptor but~~ containing a protein selected from the group consisting of:
 - (i) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 16-123 of ~~Seq. ID No. 3~~ SEQ ID NO: 4 (ALK-2), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (ii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 24-152 of ~~Seq. ID No. 5~~ SEQ ID NO: 6 (ALK-3), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (iii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 23-122 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (iv) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and sharing at least 40% amino acid identity with residues 23-122 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6);
 - (v) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid obtainable by amplification with one or more primer sequences defined by ~~Seq. ID Nos.~~ SEQ ID NOS: 12-15; or
 - (vi) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid that hybridizes under stringent conditions with a nucleic acid comprising the sequence defined by nucleotides 256-552 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6);

- (b) contacting said sample with a candidate ~~OP1~~ morphogen receptor-binding analog; and
- (c) detecting specific binding between said candidate ~~OP1~~ morphogen receptor-binding analog and said protein;

wherein binding of said candidate morphogen receptor-binding analog to said protein is indicative that said candidate analog is a morphogen receptor-binding analog.

2. **(Currently Amended)** A method for identifying an OP-1 receptor-binding analog, said analog being characterized as having substantially the same binding affinity for a cell surface receptor as OP-1, the method comprising ~~the steps of:~~

- (a) providing a cell that expresses a surface receptor protein having binding specificity for OP-1 selected from ~~the group consisting of:~~
 - (i) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 16-123 of ~~Seq. ID No. 3~~ SEQ ID NO: 4 (ALK-2), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (ii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 24-152 of ~~Seq. ID No. 5~~ SEQ ID NO: 6 (ALK-3), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (iii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 23-122 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (iv) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and sharing at least 40% amino acid identity with residues 23-122 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6);
 - (v) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid obtainable by amplification with one or more primer sequences defined by ~~Seq. ID Nos.~~ SEQ ID NOS: 12-15; or
 - (vi) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid that hybridizes under stringent conditions with a nucleic acid comprising the sequence defined by nucleotides 256-552 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6);
- (b) contacting said cell with a candidate OP-1 receptor-binding analog; and

- (c) detecting induction of an OP-1-mediated cellular response;
wherein detection of induction of said OP-1-mediated cellular response is indicative that said candidate analog is an OP-1 receptor-binding analog.
3. (Original) The method of claim 2 wherein said OP-1 mediated cellular response detected in step (c) is induction of a kinase activity, inhibition of epithelial cell growth, or induction of a cell differentiation marker.
4. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2 or 3 wherein said cell comprises a transfected nucleic acid comprising a reporter gene in operative association with a control element derived from an OP-1 inducible protein, and wherein the activity of said reporter gene can be detected as said OP-1-mediated cellular response upon stimulation by OP-1 or analog thereof in said cell.
5. (Currently Amended) The method of ~~any of claims 1-4~~ claim 2 or 3, wherein said ~~sample~~ said surface receptor protein further comprises part or all of a Type II serine/threonine kinase receptor protein having binding affinity for OP-1, activin or BMP-4.
- 6-7. (Canceled)
8. (Currently Amended) A kit for identifying OP-1 or a candidate OP-1 receptor binding analog in a sample, the kit comprising:
- (a) a receptacle adapted to receive a said sample, said receptacle and containing a protein selected from ~~the group consisting of:~~
- (i) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 16-123 of ~~Seq. ID No. 3~~ SEQ ID NO: 4 (ALK-2), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
- (ii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 24-152 of ~~Seq. ID No. 5~~ SEQ ID NO: 6 (ALK-3), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;

- (iii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 23-122 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6),; or an OP-1 binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (iv) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and sharing at least 40% amino acid identity with residues 23-122 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6);
 - (v) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid obtainable by amplification with one or more primer sequences defined by ~~Seq. ID Nos.~~ SEQ ID NOs: 12-15; or
 - (vi) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid that hybridizes under stringent conditions with a nucleic acid comprising the sequence defined by nucleotides 256-552 of ~~Seq. ID No. 7~~ SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6); and
- (b) means for detecting induction of an OP-1-mediated cellular response as a means for detecting interaction of OP-1 or a candidate OP-1 receptor-binding analog with said protein of part (a), said OP-1 or candidate analog comprising part of said sample provided to said receptacle.

9. (Canceled)

10. (Currently Amended) The kit of claim 8, ~~or 9~~ further comprising a serine/threonine Type II receptor having binding specificity for OP-1, activin or BMP-4.

11-27. (Canceled)

28. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein said morphogen is OP-1.

29. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein said morphogen is 60A, DPP, OP-2, OP-3, BMP-2, BMP-4, BMP-5, BMP-6, Vg1, GDF-1, or Vgr-1.

30. (New) The method of claim 4, wherein said surface receptor protein further comprises part or all of a Type II serine/threonine kinase receptor protein having binding affinity for OP-1, activin or BMP-4.

31. (New) A kit for identifying a binding analog for a receptor of a morphogen in a sample, said morphogen being characterized as sharing at least 60% identity or 70% homology to the C-terminal 102 amino acids of SEQ ID NO: 7, and being able to substitute for OP-1 in binding to SEQ ID NOs. 4, 6, or 8, the kit comprising:
 - (a) a receptacle adapted to receive said sample, said receptacle does not contain a Type II serine/threonine kinase morphogen receptor but contains a protein selected from:
 - (i) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 16-123 of SEQ ID NO: 4 (ALK-2), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (ii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 24-152 of SEQ ID NO: 6 (ALK-3), or an OP-1-binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (iii) a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6), or an OP-1 binding receptor analog thereof;
 - (iv) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and sharing at least 40% amino acid identity with residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6);
 - (v) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid obtainable by amplification with one or more primer sequences defined by SEQ ID NOs: 12-15; or
 - (vi) a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and encoded by a nucleic acid that hybridizes under stringent conditions with a nucleic acid comprising the sequence defined by nucleotides 256-552 of SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6); and
 - (b) means for detecting specific binding interaction of OP-1 or said candidate analog with said protein of part (a), said OP-1 or candidate analog comprising part of said sample provided to said receptacle.
32. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein said protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 16-123 of SEQ ID NO: 4 (ALK-2).

33. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein said protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 24-152 of SEQ ID NO: 6 (ALK-3).
34. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein said protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6).
35. (New) The method of claim 2, wherein said surface receptor protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 16-123 of SEQ ID NO: 4 (ALK-2).
36. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein said surface receptor protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 24-152 of SEQ ID NO: 6 (ALK-3).
37. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein said surface receptor protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6).
38. (New) The kit of claim 8 or claim 31, wherein said protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 16-123 of SEQ ID NO: 4 (ALK-2).
39. (New) The kit of claim 8 or claim 31, wherein said protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 24-152 of SEQ ID NO: 6 (ALK-3).
40. (New) The kit of claim 8 or claim 31, wherein said protein is a polypeptide chain comprising an amino acid sequence defined by residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8 (ALK-6).

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-5, 8, 10, and 28-40 constitute the pending claims in the present application. Applicants have canceled claims 6, 7, and 11-27, which are directed to non-elected inventions. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claims of similar or identical scope in future applications. Claims 1-5, 8, 10, and new claims 28-40 are directed to the elected Group I invention. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification, including the originally filed claims.

Applicants note that the Examiner has decided to search SEQ ID NOs: 4, 6, and 8 as well as all primers represented by SEQ ID NOs: 12-15.

Applicants note that the IDS has been considered by the Examiner, with the exception that reference BH on the Form PTO-1449, filed 7/22/02, has been struck through because the Examiner cannot identify the reference based on the information on the IDS.

The Office Action points out certain inconsistencies found in the Oath / Declaration, which is a copy of the Oath / Declaration of the parent application U.S.S.N. 08/448,371. Applicants have submitted a supplemental ADS (Application Data Sheets) in accordance with 37 CFR 1.76(c) to correct these defects. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.76(d), ADS governs inconsistencies in domestic and foreign priority claims between an earlier filed Oath / Declaration and a later filed ADS.

The Office Action further asserts that the title of the invention is not descriptive, and requests Applicants to provide a more appropriate title. Applicants have amended the specification to change the title according to the Examiner's suggestion.

The Office Action objects to the specification since reference to PCT/US95/05467 was not recited in the first line of the specification. Applicants have submitted the above-referenced supplemental ADS to provide the necessary domestic and foreign priority claims pursuant to 37 CFR 1.76(b). In addition, Applicants have amended the first paragraph of the specification to repeat the information already supplied in the supplemental ADS.

The Office Action also objects to the specification since no SEQ ID NO. is recited on page 11, line 29. Applicants have amended the specification to obviate this objection. Applicants submit that no new matter is introduced, because the text obviously refers to the OP-1 protein

sequence, which is set forth in SEQ ID NO: 10. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. Issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed below in the order they appear in the Office Action.

Claim objections

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 2, and 8, and suggests removing one of the commas after “(ALK-6).” Accordingly, Applicants have amended the claims to obviate this objection. Applicants have also amended the claims to uniformly use “OP-1” instead of “OP1.” Applicants submit that there is no narrowing of scope due to these amendments.

The Office Action also objects claim 5 for reciting “any of claims 1-4.” Accordingly, Applicants have adopted the Examiner’s suggestion and amended claim 5 to obviate this objection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph – scope of enablement

Claims 1-5, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabled for method of identifying binding analogs which interact with the claimed fragments of SEQ ID NO: 4, 6, and 8, does not reasonably provide enablement for methods of identifying binding analogs of proteins which are at least 40% identical to residues 23-132 of SEQ ID NO: 8, or any polypeptide chain which is amplified by the primers of SEQ ID NO: 12-15, or which hybridizes to residues 256-552 of SEQ ID NO: 8. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Specifically, the Office Action cites the Wands factors from *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ 2d, 1400 (CAFC, 1988), and asserts that the breadth of the claims is excessive with regard to claiming methods of identifying binding analogs of: a) proteins at least 40% identical to residues 23-132 of SEQ ID NO: 8, or b) proteins encoded by polynucleotides amplified by primers 12-15, or c) proteins encoded by polynucleotides that hybridizes to residues 256-552 of SEQ ID NO: 8. The Office Action contends that the specification does not teach a skilled artisan how to make a protein at least 40% identical to residues 23-132 of SEQ ID NO: 8 yet still retain the ability to bind OP-1, thus the specification has not enabled a skilled artisan to use these proteins for the

claimed screening method. The Office Action further alleges that the specification does not provide examples or guidance for making such proteins, and it is not predictable for a skilled artisan to make a functional ALK protein other than SEQ ID NOs: 4, 6, or 8.

Applicants submit that the arguments of the Office Action are based on a mis-interpretation of the case law. In fact, according to the CAFC ruling in *In re Wands*, Applicants submit that the scope of the claimed invention is fully enabled for the reasons that follow.

Jack Wands *et al.* claimed methods for the immunoassay of HBsAg by using high-affinity monoclonal IgM antibodies. The PTO Board finally rejected the broadest claim on grounds of lack of enablement. Specifically, the sole issue was whether it would require undue experimentation to produce high-affinity IgM monoclonal antibodies with the recited avidity ("having a binding affinity constant for said HBsAg determinants of at least 10^9 M^{-1} ").

The undisputed facts of the case are: Wands made 10 fusions, the first four of which were unsuccessful due to technical problems and inexperience. The next 6 fusions before filing and the 11th fusion after filing were all successful. From among the 6 successful fusions, they screened and obtained 143 so-called "high-binding hybridomas," which secrete antibodies that bind the antigen (HBsAg) with at least 10,000 cpm in the commercial RIA assay used by Wands. From these 143 hybridomas, they screened 9 and froze the remaining 134. Among the 9 hybridomas screened, they found that 4 were actually IgM monoclonal Abs that fall within the scope of the claim, 3 were found to be IgG monoclonal antibodies (outside the scope), and the remaining 2 were also IgM Abs, but were not tested for binding constants.

The PTO board held that only 4 out of 143 hybridomas were within the scope of the claim, and thus concluded that a skilled artisan would require undue experimentation to make the IgM antibody required to practice the claimed method. The CAFC, however, ruled that "the board's interpretation of the data is erroneous. ... The PTO's position leads to the absurd conclusion that the more hybridomas an applicant makes and saves without testing, the less predictable the applicant's results become."

Applicants note a striking parallelism between the Wands fact pattern and the claimed invention. First of all, Wands claimed an assay method using a specific kind of antibody with a desired functional feature (a binding affinity constant for the antigen of at least 10^9 M^{-1}). The present application claims an assay method using a few specific kinds of receptors with a desired

functional feature (a polypeptide chain having binding affinity for OP-1 and sharing at least 40% amino acid identity with residues 23-122 of ALK-6; encoded by a nucleic acid obtainable by amplification with one or more primer sequences defined by SEQ ID NOs: 12-15; or encoded by a nucleic acid that hybridizes under stringent conditions with a nucleic acid comprising the sequence defined by nucleotides 256-552 of ALK-6). In fact, the subject peptides of the claimed invention are not purely defined by function, but rather defined by function correlating to structure.

Secondly, the Wands method uses IgM, which can be made through a well-known process (monoclonal antibody generation) by screening large amounts of candidate antibodies, for a specific subset of antibodies with the desired function. The presently claimed method uses, for example, a polypeptide of claim 1(iv), which can be made through another well-known process (combinatorial random mutagenesis) by screening large numbers of randomly mutated candidate polynucleotides for a specific subset of polynucleotides encoding proteins with the desired function (binds OP-1 and at least 40% identical to residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8). In other words, contrary to the contentions of the Office Action, Applicants need not tell a skilled artisan which 60% of the above-referenced sequence can be mutated to what amino acids, yet still retain the ability to bind OP-1. Combinatorial mutagenesis coupled with functional screening is simply much faster and efficient in generating the desired polynucleotides. To say that Applicants have only identified SEQ ID NOs: 4, 6, and 8 that bind OP-1, and that Applicants have provided no guidance or working examples other than those of ALK-2, -3, and -6, is analogous to saying that Wands had only identified four IgM antibodies falling within the scope of the claimed methods, and that Wands had provided no guidance or working examples other than those 4 identified IgM antibodies.

For the same reason, Applicants submit that PCR amplification using primers of known sequences was a routine and well-known process in the art of molecular biology at the time of filing. Coupled with a functional screen of OP-1 binding, a skilled artisan would have been able to make the polypeptide of claim 1(v) without undue experimentation.

Similarly, Applicants submit that high stringency hybridization using a known probe sequence was a routine and well-known process in the art of molecular biology at the time of

filing. Coupled with a functional screen of OP-1 binding, a skilled artisan would have been able to make the polypeptide of claim 1(vi) without undue experimentation.

All these techniques for making the subject polypeptides were well known as of the filing date of the instant application. Pursuant to MPEP 2164.01, "A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art."

In addition, since ALK-6 and ALK-3 are 46% identical in the ligand-binding domain (see page 7, 1st full paragraph), it is conceivable that an ALK-3 homolog / derivative that is 99% identical to ALK-3 could be just 45% identical to the reference sequence ALK-6. Since ALK-3 binds OP-1, this putative derivative "ALK-3" would be highly likely to bind to OP-1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is fully enabled for the kinds of polypeptides that can be used for the method.

Nevertheless, Applicants have submitted new dependent claims 32-40 to expedite prosecution and to further clarify the subject matter claimed. Applicants submit that at least these dependent claims fulfill the enablement requirement, as the instant Office Action acknowledges.

The Office Action further alleges that Applicants have not enabled the scope of cellular response recited in claim 2.

Applicants submit that numerous OP-1-mediated cellular and biological responses were known at the time of filing. Pursuant to MPEP 2164.01, "A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art." Regardless, the instant specification has meticulously set forth a number of OP-1 mediated cellular responses (see, for example, Example 9) which can all be employed to practice the claimed assay. For example, excluding the ones already recited in claim 3, OP-1 also induces Alkaline phosphatase activity, PTH-mediated cAMP production, or a reporter gene in operable association with a OP-1-responsive promoter (such as the PAI-1 promoter described in Example 9). A skilled artisan could easily identify, among the rich literature resulting from more than a decade of OP-1 related research, other OP-1-mediated biological responses without undue experimentation.

Thus Applicants submit that the pending claims as amended fully satisfy the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph – written description

Claims 1-5, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the invention(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the claimed invention encompasses a genus of polypeptide sequences, such as polypeptides at least 40% identical to a defined fragment of ALK-6, polypeptides encoded by polynucleotides that hybridize under stringent conditions with a defined sequence, etc. Thus, the Office Action asserts that structural features that distinguish the claimed genus of polypeptides from other polypeptides are lacking from the disclosure. The Office Action further asserts that because there are no common structural attributes that identify the members of the genus, and the genus is highly variant, the disclosed few SEQ ID NOs. are not sufficient to describe the whole genus, and the Applicants do not have possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that the several genera of the polypeptides (40% identical to ALK-6, encoded by polynucleotide amplified by primers, and encoded by a polynucleotide obtained by high stringency hybridization) all meet the written description requirement.

First of all, Applicants wish to direct the Examiner's attention to Example 9 of the "Revised Interim Written Description Guidelines Training Materials" published on the USPTO website (a copy of Example 9 is submitted herewith as **Exhibit A**). In Example 9 of the Guidelines, the hypothetical claim is directed to a genus of nucleic acids, all of which must hybridize with SEQ ID NO: 1, and must encode a protein with a specific activity. Since the hypothetical SEQ ID NO: 1 is novel and fully disclosed, and falls within the scope of the hypothetical claim, the single species meets the written description requirement. As to the genus claim, the Guidelines further elaborates that "a person of skill in the art would not expect substantial variation among species encompassed within the scope of the claims because the highly stringent hybridization conditions set forth in the claim yield structurally similar DNAs. Thus a representative number of species is disclosed...and the level of skill and knowledge in the art are adequate to determine that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention." the Guidelines' conclusion: The claimed invention is adequately described.

In accord with that analysis, the subject polypeptide as defined in the claims must also be encoded by a nucleic acid that must hybridize with nucleotides 256-552 of SEQ ID NO: 8 under high stringency conditions. The encoded polypeptide must also have a specific activity (bind to OP-1). Thus, such embodiments of the subject polypeptides are fully described under the standard of the Guidelines.

Similarly, although the Guidelines does not have an example for nucleic acids obtained by amplification using defined primers, Applicants submit that the same logic applies in this situation. Specifically, a person of skill in the art would not expect substantial variation among species encompassed within the scope of the claims because the amplification process inherently yields structurally similar DNAs – the primers must be able to hybridize to the template to be able to amplify the target. In fact, in certain amplification processes such as PCR, the hybridization of the primers to the template DNA (at the annealing sites for the primers) must be highly stringent, since the primer-template hybrid must be able to withstand the usual 72 °C polymerase extension temperature without falling apart. Thus, at the primer annealing sites, the match between the primers and the template must be identical or nearly identical. Also, both primers in the amplification pair must anneal simultaneously to the template for the amplification to work. In a sense, this is even more stringent than high stringency hybridization. Since at least one polypeptide is encoded by a nucleic acid falling within the scope, a representative number of species are disclosed, and the level of skill and knowledge in the art are adequate to determine that Applicants are in possession of the claimed invention.

Lastly, polypeptide sequences sharing at least 40% sequence identity to residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8 and binding OP-1 can be analogized to Example 13, claim 2, of the above-referenced Guideline. There is a key difference between the instant claimed invention and the “variant” claim in Example 13. The instant claimed invention sets forth distinguishing functional and structural attributes shared by all members of the subject genus – at least 40% identical to residues 23-122 of SEQ ID NO: 8, and binding to OP-1. Such distinguishing attributes are missing in the generic “variant claim” of Example 13, which “do not place any limit on the number of amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions.” While the lack of such common attributes renders the variant claim without proper written description, Applicants submit that the instant specification discloses at least three members that fall within the scope of

the claim. These distinct species are different enough to represent the full range of polypeptides falling within the scope of the claims. Thus a representative number of species are disclosed, and the level of skill and knowledge in the art are adequate to determine that Applicants are in possession of the claimed invention.

The Office Action further contends that Applicants have not adequately described all of the potential cellular responses recited in claim 2, and that Applicants have only identified a small number of cellular responses for measuring the effect of a binding analog.

Applicants submit that many other OP-1 mediated cellular responses were well known in the art at the time of filing. The instant specification describes the following as exemplary OP-1-mediated cellular responses: ligand-induced receptor autophosphorylation (pages 32-34 in Example 5); ligand-induced reporter gene activation (page 34 in Example 5, also see page 50 of Example 9.2); expression of osteoblast differentiation markers such as Alkaline Phosphatase, PTH-mediated cAMP and osteocalcin (pages 47-50 of Example 9.1); and inhibition of epithelial cell proliferation (page 51 of Example 9.3). The art also describes the following OP-1-mediated cellular responses: expression of NCAM and L1 (Perides *et al.*, *J Biol Chem* **269**(1):765-70, Jan. 7, 1994), expression of type-I collagen (Maliakal *et al.*, *Growth Factors* **11**(3): 227-34, 1994), induction of endochondrial bone formation (Asahina *et al.*, *J Cell Biol* **123**(4): 921-33, Nov. 1993); alcian blue staining at pH 1 (Asahina *et al.*, *J Cell Biol* **123**(4): 921-33, Nov. 1993), and types II, IX and X collagens expression (Asahina *et al.*, *J Cell Biol* **123**(4): 921-33, Nov. 1993). Pursuant to MPEP 2164.01, "A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art." Therefore, Applicants should not be unduly burdened to enumerate a laundry list of known OP-1-mediated cellular responses. In addition, any later-developed OP-1-mediated cellular responses also fall within the scope of the claimed invention according to *In re Hogan* 559 F.2d 595, 604, 194 USPQ 527, 535 (CCPA 1977).

Based on the above-arguments, Applicants submit that all pending claims meet the written description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 USC 112. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Office Action asserts that claims 1-5 and 8-10 are incomplete (lacking a conclusion step) and suggests correction. Applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggestion and amended method claims 1 and 2 to obviate this rejection. Applicants also submit that claim 8 is a kit claim, not a method claim. Thus, a conclusion step would not be necessary for claim 8 and its dependent claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, and 8 as confusing since the metes and bounds of "substantially the same binding affinity" are unknown.

Pursuant to MPEP 2173.05(b), certain relative claim terminologies are permitted: "Acceptability of the claim language depends on whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed, in light of the specification. When a term of degree is present, determine whether a standard is disclosed or whether one of skill in the art would be apprised of the scope of the claim. When a term of degree is present in a claim, first a determination is to be made as to whether the specification provides some standard for measuring that degree."

Based on this criterion, Applicants submit that the specification clearly sets forth the standard to measure the degree of affinity, using the well-known art-accepted dissociation constant K_d . For example, the instant specification has described in several occasions the relative affinity of bindings between the subject ligands and receptors and their measurement standard K_d (See, for example, page 7, first full paragraph). Thus, Applicants submit that a skilled artisan would understand the meaning of the term "substantially the same" in view of the common knowledge of the art and the instant specification.

This standpoint is further consistent with the same MPEP section, which particularly listed the use of the word "substantially" as being definite if a skilled artisan would be reasonably apprised of the meaning of the term, especially in view of the guidelines set forth in the specification: "[t]he term 'substantially' is often used in conjunction with another term to describe a particular characteristic of the claimed invention. It is a broad term. *In re Nehrenberg*,

280 F.2d 161, 126 USPQ 383 (CCPA 1960). The court held that the limitation 'to substantially increase the efficiency of the compound as a copper extractant' was definite in view of the general guidelines contained in the specification. *In re Mattison*, 509 F.2d 563, 184 USPQ 484 (CCPA 1975). The court held that the limitation 'which produces substantially equal E and H plane illumination patterns' was definite because one of ordinary skill in the art would know what was meant by 'substantially equal.' *Andrew Corp. v. Gabriel Electronics*, 847 F.2d 819, 6 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1988)." Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 8, parts (i) – (iii) are rejected as confusing since ALK-6 is an OP-1 receptor, and it is not clear what is meant by "or an OP-1-binding analog thereof."

Applicants submit that a skilled artisan would understand that "an OP-1 binding analog thereof" means a receptor analog of ALK-2, -3 or -6, which binds OP-1. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the subject matter claimed. No new matter was introduced, and there is no narrowing of scope due to these amendments.

Claims 1, 2, and 8 are rejected as being vague for reciting "stringent conditions." The Office Action requests Applicants to introduce exact hybridization conditions into the claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because the term "stringent conditions" is supported in the specification and is well understood in the art to encompass conditions of hybridization which allow hybridization of structurally related, but not structurally dissimilar, nucleic acids. The term "stringent" is a term of art which is understood by the skilled artisan to describe any of a number of alternative hybridization and wash conditions which allow annealing of only highly complementary nucleic acids.

In particular, the specification describes stringent hybridization conditions on page 8, 1st full paragraph. The paragraph refers to the most used laboratory manual "Molecular Cloning" for further details of the conditions. The paragraph also sets forth one exemplary such condition as "hybridization in 40% formamide, 5×SSPE, 5×Denhardt's Solution, and 0.1% SDS at 37°C. overnight, and washing in 0.1×SSPE, 0.1% SDS at 50°C." As a skilled artisan would appreciate, many equivalent protocols exist and several popular molecular cloning manuals describe suitable conditions for stringent hybridization and, furthermore, provide formulas for calculating the length of hybrids expected to be stable under these conditions (see e.g. *Current Protocols in*

Molecular Biology, John Wiley & Sons, N.Y. (1989), 6.3.1-6 or 13.3.6; or pages 9.47-9.57 of Sambrook, *et al.* (1989) *Molecular Cloning*, 2nd ed., Cold Spring Harbor Press). This is also consistent with the MPEP section recited above, which states that a claim terminology reciting a degree is not indefinite if the specification sets forth how the degree is to be measured (*supra*). Thus, the term “stringent” is not indefinite, but rather a functional description of many equivalent variations in salt and temperature conditions. Indeed it is well understood that there are many functionally equivalent methodologies for achieving stringent conditions. Each of these methodologies involves a number of interrelating variables such as the selection of hybridization membrane composition, hybridization buffer composition, hybridization buffer temperature, wash buffer composition, and wash buffer temperature. The skilled artisan recognizes that many of these factors interrelate. For example, the correct temperature for a stringent hybridization will depend upon the chemical composition of the hybridization buffer (68 °C for aqueous buffers versus 42 °C for buffers containing 50% formamide), and the selection of hybridization buffer conditions will depend upon the composition of the membrane used (nitrocellulose versus nylon) (see Sambrook, *et al.* (1989) *Molecular Cloning*, 2nd ed., Cold Spring Harbor Press). Therefore, in view of the specification, Applicants respectfully submit that the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter has been clearly set forth and one of skill in the art would readily appreciate the scope of the claim. To limit the claimed method to just one specific hybridization condition would unduly restrict the scope of the claimed invention, and allow a potential infringer to easily “engineer around” the claimed invention without any inventive step or undue experimentation. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected as being confusing since it is unclear what “cellular response” is being measured in part (c) of the claims. The Office Action asserts that Applicants have only enabled the assays recited in claim 3.

Applicants submit that the Office Action has confused the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that Applicants had not enabled any cellular responses (which Applicants traverse, as argued above) other than the ones recited in claim 3, Applicants submit that the meaning of the term “cellular response” itself is clear (see below). Pursuant to MPEP 2173.04, “[b]readth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness. *In re Miller*, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA

1971). If the scope of the subject matter embraced by the claims is clear, and if applicants have not otherwise indicated that they intend the invention to be of a scope different from that defined in the claims, then the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.”

Applicants submit that “cellular response,” when used in the context of the claims, clearly means a cellular response resulting from OP-1-mediated signal transduction. The Office Action fails to point out what embodiment might or might not fall within the scope of the claimed invention if the term “cellular response” is used, thus a rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, appears to be improper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 5, and 10 are rejected as being confusing since the purpose of the reporter gene, the control element, or the additional type II receptor are allegedly unclear.

Applicants submit that a skilled artisan looks to the specification to understand how to make and use the invention. Despite the relatively high level of skill in the art regarding the use of promoters and reporter genes, the instant specification has nevertheless set forth the details of how to use OP-1-responsive promoters and reporter genes to measure OP-1-mediated cellular response (see page 34 in Example 5, also see page 50 of Example 9.2). Therefore, a skilled artisan would readily understand the metes and bounds of the claimed invention in claim 4. Applicants have nevertheless amended the claim to further clarify the subject matter claimed. Similarly, the specification has described in detail in Example 8 that certain OP-1 receptors need a Type II receptor for binding OP-1 like morphogens, while certain other receptors do not need such a Type II receptor for OP-1 binding. The skilled artisan would not be confused as to the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Claim 5 is rejected as being indefinite for lacking antecedent basis when using the term “sample.” Applicants have amended claim 5 to obviate this rejection. Antecedent basis for the newly inserted “surface receptor protein” is found in claim 2(a).

Claim 8 is rejected as being indefinite because the phrase “candidate analog comprising part of said sample” is unclear.

Applicants have amended claim 8 to further clarify the subject matter claimed to obviate this rejection. Applicants submit that all amended claims conform to the second paragraph of 35 USC 112. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting Rejections

The Office Action states that claims 1-5 and 8-10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over one or more claims of the co-pending U.S. Application 09/267,963.

Applicants are not aware of a co-owned U.S. Patent Application with the above-identified serial number. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyazono (WO 94/11502) in view of Sampath (JBC 267: 20352, 1992), further in view of the Stratagene catalog (1988, p39).

Specifically, Miyazono allegedly discloses the sequences of the subject ALK-2, 3, and 6 TGF-beta superfamily receptors, while failing to teach that the ALKs bind OP-1. Sampath allegedly discloses OP-1 as a TGF-beta superfamily protein. Thus, the Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to screen the receptors of Miyazono using OP-1 as a candidate ligand. Similarly, the Office Action concludes that since the Stratagene catalog teaches several general advantages of using kits in biological research, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to arrive at the claimed kit. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons which follow.

Pursuant to MPEP 706.02(j), three basic criteria have to be met before a *prima facie* case of obviousness rejection can be made: 1) the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations; 2) some motivation or suggestion, either found in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine or modify the references must be present; and 3) a reasonable expectation of success is required.

Applicants have amended claim 1 and added new claims 28, 29 and 31 to clarify the subject matter being claimed. Applicants have also amended claims 2, 8, and their dependent

claims, and added new claim 30 to clarify the subject matter claimed. As amended, claims 1, 28, 29, and 31 are directed to methods and kits for identifying morphogen analogs that bind the recited type-I receptors in the absence of type-II receptors. Claims 2-5, 8, 10, and 30 are directed to methods and kits for identifying OP-1 analogs that elicit an OP-1-mediated cellular response.

Applicants submit that the subject matter of claim 1 (and its related claims) is partly based on the surprising discovery that the OP-1 related morphogens can bind type I receptors (such as the ALK receptors and analogs thereof recited in claim 1) *in the absence* of type II Ser/Thr kinase receptors. This is in contrast to other remotely related TGF-beta superfamily proteins, such as the TGF-beta proteins and activins, which do not bind either type-I or type-II receptors alone, and only bind both type-I and type II receptors in a complex.

For example, the instant specification teaches on page 12, first full paragraph, that the invention contemplates 1) OP-1 or OP-1 analog (morphogen) in specific binding interaction with a type-I receptor (or receptor analog); 2) OP-1 or OP-1 analog (morphogen) in specific binding interaction with a type-II receptor (or receptor analog); and 3) OP-1 or OP-1 analog (morphogen) in specific binding interaction with both a type-I and a type-II receptors. The instant specification further teaches, on page 40 (Example 8) that OP-1 and the related morphogen BMP-4 can bind type-I receptor (ALK-2, -3, and -6) *in the absence* of any type-II receptors.

On the other hand, Miyazono (WO 94/11502) *teaches away* from the claimed invention. Specifically, Miyazono describes the cloning of 6 receptors sharing sequence homology to receptors for TGF-beta superfamily proteins. These receptors were named as "ALK" for "Activin-Like Kinases." Miyazono describes on page 33 that "PAE cells [which only have type I receptors] do not bind activin because of the lack of type II receptors for activin." Miyazono further describes on page 29, lines 26-29, that "[t]ransfection of cDNAs for ALKs into COS-1 cells did not show any appreciable binding of ¹²⁵I-TGFβ1, consistent with the observation that type I receptors do not bind TGF-β in the absence of type II receptors." Therefore, in view of the fact that the ALK receptors (type I receptors) do *not* bind either TGF-β or activin alone, a skilled artisan would *not* be motivated to screen for other potential ligands of the ALK receptors in the absence of a type II receptor. Thus, even if a skilled artisan had motivation to combine Miyazono and Sampath, the skilled artisan would end up screening for binding of OP-1 or its related ligands to a type I and a type II receptor, and not what is presently claimed. In other words, the

combined teaching would still fail to teach a skilled artisan to screen in the absence of a type II receptor. For the same reason, a skilled artisan would also have no reasonable expectation of success in arriving at the claimed invention. By screening using both receptors, both activin-like ligands and morphogen analogs would be identified. In contrast, the claimed invention (claim 1, etc.) utilizes only type I receptors, and would only identify morphogen analogs.

For the kit claims, the Stratagene catalog, either alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, does not correct any of the above defects. Therefore, all three requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness are not met. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the second embodiment (OP-1-mediated cellular response), Applicants submit that the claimed invention (represented by claims 2, 8, and their dependent claims) is partly based on the surprising discovery that the ALKs (type I receptors) can participate in the signaling of morphogens such as OP-1. While the idea of screening other TGF-beta superfamily proteins for potential ligands that bind the ALK receptors may be obvious in view of the cited references, the results of such screening are not obvious – otherwise, there would be no need to screen at all. If the results (that is, which of the numerous TGF-beta super family proteins actually bind a particular ALK receptor) are not obvious, then a further method (such as the claimed invention in claim 2) based on a specific result of that experiment (OP-1 binds ALK-2, -3 and -6) is also not obvious. This standpoint is further supported by the disclosure of Miyazono and the instant specification (see Table I on page 40) that certain ALK receptors just cannot bind OP-1 or BMP-4, either in the presence or in the absence of a type II receptor.

In summary, Miyazono and Sampath, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest that OP-1 actually binds any of the ALK receptors. Thus, the combination of all cited references, assuming *arguendo* they could be properly combined, still would not teach or suggest all the limitations of the instant application. In addition, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine any or all of the above cited references, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge available to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of filing. Furthermore, without knowing whether OP-1 binds any of the ALK receptors, there would be no reasonable expectation of success for a skilled artisan to arrive at the claimed invention (identifying OP-1 analog using ALKs) based on the disclosure of the cited references.

Regarding the kit claims, the Stratagene catalog, either alone or in combination with any of the cited references, does not correct any of the above deficiencies. Neither do any of the other cited references (Matsuzaki and the two references by Dijke *et al.*), taken either alone or in combination, correct any of the above-identified deficiencies. Thus, all three requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness have not been satisfied. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103 are respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

The Examiner may address any questions raised by this submission to the undersigned at 617-951-7000. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition therefor and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 18-1945**.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 11, 2003

Customer No: 28120
Docketing Specialist
Ropes & Gray, LLP
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617-951-7000
Fax: 617-951-7050



Yu Lu, Ph.D.
Patent Agent
Reg. No. 50,306

e.g. expression vectors, the necessary common attribute is the ORF (SEQ ID NO: 2).

Weighing all factors including (1) that the full length ORF (SEQ ID NO: 2) is disclosed and (2) that any substantial variability within the genus arises due to addition of elements that are not part of the inventor's particular contribution, taken in view of the level of knowledge and skill in the art, one skilled in the art would recognize from the disclosure that the applicant was in possession of the genus of DNAs that comprise SEQ ID NO: 2.

Conclusion: The written description requirement is satisfied.

Example 9: Hybridization

Specification: The specification discloses a single cDNA (SEQ ID NO:1) which encodes a protein that binds to a dopamine receptor and stimulates adenylate cyclase activity. The specification includes an example wherein the complement of SEQ ID NO: 1 was used under highly stringent hybridization conditions (6XSSC and 65 degrees Celsius) for the isolation of nucleic acids that encode proteins that bind to dopamine receptor and stimulate adenylate cyclase activity. The hybridizing nucleic acids were not sequenced. They were expressed and several were shown to encode proteins that bind to a dopamine receptor and stimulate adenylate cyclase activity. These sequences may or may not be the same as SEQ ID NO: 1.

Claim:

An isolated nucleic acid that specifically hybridizes under highly stringent conditions to the complement of the sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 1,

wherein said nucleic acid encodes a protein that binds to a dopamine receptor and stimulates adenylate cyclase activity.

Analysis:

A review of the full content of the specification indicates that the essential feature of the claimed invention is the isolated nucleic acid that hybridizes to SEQ ID NO: 1 under highly stringent conditions and encodes a protein with a specific function. The art indicates that hybridization techniques using a known DNA as a probe under highly stringent conditions were conventional in the art at the time of filing.

The claim is drawn to a genus of nucleic acids all of which must hybridize with SEQ ID NO: 1 and must encode a protein with a specific activity.

The search of the prior art indicates that SEQ ID NO: 1 is novel and unobvious.

There is a single species disclosed (a molecule consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1) that is within the scope of the claimed genus.

There is actual reduction to practice of the disclosed species.

Now turning to the genus analysis, a person of skill in the art would not expect substantial variation among species encompassed within the scope of the claims because the highly stringent hybridization conditions set forth in the claim yield structurally similar DNAs. Thus, a representative number of species is disclosed, since highly stringent hybridization conditions in combination with the coding function of DNA and the level of

skill and knowledge in the art are adequate to determine that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention.

Conclusion: The claimed invention is adequately described.